



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

LEGALIZED ABSOLUTISM EN ROUTE FROM GREECE TO ROME

THE deification of Hellenistic kings and Roman emperors is commonly regarded as a manifestation of religious life.¹ In this paper, on the contrary, the view is maintained that it was essentially a political device. I have, accordingly, attempted in the following pages to arrange on a somewhat novel principle the chief materials bearing upon this institution during a critical period of its development. I believe that a better understanding of the significance and importance of the institution itself is the result.

In three specific points, moreover, I have failed to find my conclusions anticipated in the extensive and widely scattered literature of the subject. These three points are: (1) that the Roman Republic escaped the need of forming permanent treaties with the Greek states by exploiting the position and rights conveyed to it by deification (see below, pp. 30 and 37 ff.); (2) that the apotheosis of rulers at their death, being necessary to validate their *acta*, was introduced expressly for this purpose (see below, pp. 33, 35, and 42 ff.); (3) that in the Roman application of the principle of deification of rulers an important distinction was drawn between *ingenui* and *liberti*—between citizens by birth and citizens by adoption (see below, pp. 40 and 43 ff.).

These conclusions, I believe, help materially to establish the truth of my original contention, that, as Tacitus says, the worship of rulers, *specie religionis*, was really an *arx aeternae dominationis*.

From the standpoint of the constitutional historian the most important product of the century which followed the birth of Alexander the Great was the union then achieved of groups of city-states into large territorial aggregates. The city-state seemed to the contemporaries of Aristotle, as to the contemporaries of Pericles, indispensable for the maintenance of civil liberty. It alone

¹ Primitive man, who thought spirit powers to be incarnate in dangerous or useful animals, could hardly escape making his king a god (Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, third ed., vol. III., *The Dying God*). But when he ceased to be primitive his point of view changed. Thus in the time of Ptolemy II., Ergamenes, king of the Ethiopians, "having received a Greek education which emancipated him from the superstitions of his countrymen", refused to have his body treated as merely the receptacle of an ancestral deity. Yet we are commonly told that Alexandria and Athens accepted the ideas of animism at the very time that they were discarded in Meroe. *Credat Judaeus Apella, non ego.*

guaranteed the reign of law in public and private affairs. Besides being the only instrument devised by free and civilized peoples for preserving order, administering justice, and collecting taxes, it alone enabled all citizens to participate in politics; and without the intimacy which it produced among its inhabitants the constant interchange of ideas between creative geniuses and the receptive masses, which made the advance of culture steady, vital, and rapid, was unthinkable. Autonomy, however, was thought, in the age of Aristotle as never before, to be essential in a city-state, and the right of local self-government was now protected not only by strong sentiment, but also by the most authoritative political science. It could not be infringed with impunity, and the experience of the tyrants in Sicily and the tyrannical cities in old Greece had by this time proved clearly that lawless constraint would not be tolerated long. Yet the demonstration had been made with equal decisiveness that the city-states individually had failed to meet the need of defense against outsiders, of peace between communities, and of order within them. Accordingly, the great administrative problem which pressed for solution during the rise of Macedon and Rome was how to conciliate city autonomy with a powerful protective government.

Three notable solutions were forthcoming in the century following 356 B.C. One of them was that reached and applied by Rome in Italy. Its essential features were, on the one hand, the incorporation of men as individuals or in groups, as municipalities, into her citizen body in order the better to plant the faithful Roman and Latin colonies up and down the peninsula; and, on the other hand, the formation of the well-known perpetual treaties with the new and old cities in Italy—treaties by which the “allies” of Rome obligated themselves for all time to render her military aid and to carry on negotiations with one another and with the outside world only through her. Such treaties stopped at the edge of Italy. As Matthaei² has shown recently, the normal relation of Rome with the Greek world was defined as *pax et amicitia* (*εἰρήνη καὶ φιλία*): when a *foedus* was arranged it was a *symmachia* of the regular Greek sort, terminable at will, or at the end of a stated time, or on the completion of a given act; and, as the Romans used it, terminated in fact when its own conditions were satisfied. Nothing was arranged in the normal status of *pax et amicitia* as to contributions of men and money to be made to Rome; nor was any limitation placed on the diplomatic liberty of the contracting parties. Yet in the course of the first generation

² *Classical Quarterly*, I. 182 ff. (1907).

after 200 B.C. Rome put the same demands upon her Greek *amici* as she put upon her *socii* in Italy. In the case of the latter she did not exceed her treaty rights: in the case of the *amici*, according to Matthaei,³ she acted without the least regard for formalities or the pretense of justice. This view I believe to be incorrect. Lawlessness of this kind was not only intolerable in a constitutional world such as existed in the Mediterranean areas in the second century B.C., but also quite unnecessary.

Another of the three remedies for the evils of city particularism I shall not enlarge upon here. The federal leagues of the Aetolians, Achaeans, Boeotians, Phocians, Lycians, Ionians, Islanders, and other peoples, need only be alluded to; and it is the idea for which they stood—union for protection against the outside world and one another, separation for all other matters—that we commend most highly to-day.

Of much larger contemporary import and interest, however, was the third, that which Alexander the Great devised.⁴ It was a stroke

³ *Classical Quarterly*, I. 203 ff.

⁴ Eduard Meyer (*Kleine Schriften*, pp. 302 ff.) has controverted, successfully, I am convinced, the view of Hogarth (*English Historical Review*, II. 317 ff., 1887; cf. Niese, *Hist. Zeitschrift*, LXXIX. 1 ff., 1897) that Alexander did not demand for himself divine honors, but that they were pressed upon him by his subjects. It is not a case of either—or, but of both—and. It is of course true that before Alexander's time Lysander (Duris in *Plutarch, Lysander*, 18), Philip, and others, were given *ισθέοι τιμai* by Greek cities subject to their will. The originality of Alexander consisted in turning the need of the Greek cities, as well as the teaching of Aristotle (see below, pp. 37–38), to service in state-building.

Wilamowitz (*Aristoteles und Athen*, II. 414 ff. and *Staat und Gesellschaft der Griechen*, pp. 151 ff., where he says: “Die Göttlichkeit des Herrschers war eine unausbleibliche Folge davon, dass die absolute Herrschaft, die nur dem Ausnahmemenschen zukommt, zur Institution geworden war”), Kaerst (*Geschichte des Hellenistischen Zeitalters*, II. 209 ff.), and Bauer (*Vom Griechentum zum Christentum*, chs. iv. and v.), trace the disposition of the Greek cities to deify Lysander, Alexander, and others, not to the political necessity of legalizing despotism, but to a genuinely religious sentiment felt, it is alleged, by the Greeks for great personalities. That, it seems to me, is to speak, if at all, with Aristotle, and perhaps with Alexander and his *diadochi*, but not with the generality of people whose ideas eventually prevailed. With them the possession of absolute power was the sole prerequisite. This is, indeed, the inference which Kaerst, despite his theory, has to make from his examination of the available data: “Wir finden fast durchaus die sakrale Verehrung in engem Zusammenhang mit dem politischen Abhängigkeitsverhältnis der Städte zu den Herrschern, so dass der Kult, auch wenn er nicht unmittelbar von diesen veranlasst ist, doch eben ein sakraler Ausdruck des Abhängigkeitsverhältnisses wird” (II. 408). This conclusion, moreover, is not invalidated by the brilliant article of Kahrstedt, “Frauen auf Antiken Münzen” (*Klio*, X. 261 ff., 1910). We may grant with Kahrstedt that, as wives of kings, queens had no right to appear as goddesses on imperial coins, and that they acquired it only on their death by apotheosis; nevertheless, even though they were not colleagues of their husbands in the government, their power in the state was great and well known to the subject cities. The most powerful queens are the

of genius. To himself he secured the supreme and absolute direction of ecumenical affairs and the right to interfere at pleasure in every city in his empire by requesting each one of them to enroll him among its gods. The greeting of Ammon, whose influence had waxed in Greece as that of Delphi had waned, gave them an adequate pretext to accede to his suggestion; for, once Zeus through his most authoritative oracle had recognized Alexander as his son, no valid objection could be offered to his deification even by men who, in this age of general indifference, retained their faith in supernatural powers or their aversion to religious change.

When the Greek cities had placed Alexander in their circles of deities he was at once free from all the treaty obligations accepted by him at the Congress of Corinth, and his first effort in his new capacity was to rid his realm of all its homeless and lawless men by requiring every city to receive back its exiles. What a gain to the world that this great problem could be finally attacked vigorously yet legally! Of course, Alexander had become with deification, not a Homeric, but a fourth-century B.C. god—one who had law in his own nature, and operated, not capriciously, but by means of general enactments.⁵

The deification of a living ruler was, accordingly, in its genesis and essentially a political contrivance: it was only formally and secondarily a matter of religion.⁶ At the death of the god-king, ones who appear most frequently as deities on the city coins. More than flattery of their husbands or sons is involved. The royal title was unnecessary for the receipt of divine honors even in the case of men. Antigonus I., for example, was deified by the cities of his satrapy while still in theory a subordinate.

⁵ *Προστάγματα*, a term which was subsequently used to designate the “commands” issued to their devotees by the Egyptian and Syrian deities.

⁶ It is not my purpose to trace the history of the religious forms which were used in the worship of the deified kings. In the beginning at least they were not different from those due any other god (see below, p. 38). Naturally, the vote of the sovereign assembly which made the king a god was an addition to the customary ritual, but it was the same electoral act which had from of old legalized the importation of foreign deities, and the consultation of an oracle was its common preface (see the cases of Asklepios and the “heroes” of the Cleisthenian *phylae* in Athens). The transfer of the god-king from earth to Olympus did not require the manufacture of altogether new machinery. The Attic vase painters knew how Hercules, Dionysus, and Ganymede reached the divine abode. Still, less symbolical modes of transit were required by a less polytheistic and more prosaic world, as Cumont has shown in his recent articles on the subject, “L’Aigle Funéraire des Syriens et l’Apothéose des Empereurs”, *Rev. de l’Histoire des Religions*, LXII. 119 ff. (1910); LXIII. 208 ff. (1911). Naturally, the birthday or the accession-day—*Epiphania*—of god-rulers was a more striking and significant occasion than anything similar in the careers of other deities. Hence the celebration of the *γενέθλιος ἡμέρα* (*natalis*) or the *ἡμέρα διαδήματος* on its monthly recurrence did not, indeed, bring with it a new religious form, but it emphasized greatly an old one. See W. Schmidt, *Geburtstag im Altertum*, and Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VII. 1, s. v. *Τενέθλιος ἡμέρα*.

"when he departed the life among men", as the stock phrase ran, the usages applied from of old to the honored dead were rendered to him—not before. Those err completely who derive the apotheosis of living rulers from the cultus of the dead.⁷ Only the departed became "heroes" in Greece; and it was primarily for the purpose of guarding and sanctioning the social and political order which they had established while in the flesh that departed rulers became or remained gods in Alexander's time and thereafter. The legislation of city-states had continuous validity because of its popular source: it acquired its authority through being an expression of the will of the eternal god Demos, as the Athenians phrased it when in 229 B.C. they restated the theory of their state in Hellenistic terms. The *acta* of a deceased monarch, on the other hand, like those of a Roman magistrate at the expiry of his term, would have ceased to be any longer valid had their author not remained a god. The same necessity led the Greeks to deify their rulers which forces the German emperor to seek in the divine right of kings a sanction for acts which rest upon his own will alone. Deification stood to the *acta* of departed rulers as the *lex* did to the *edictum* of the annual praetor.⁸

To sophisticated Greeks of the third century B.C. all the gods were simply departed men. The Athenians sang on a noted occasion: "The other gods are a long way off, or have no ears, or no existence, or pay no heed to us; but [turning to the deified Demetrius] thee we greet face to face, a true god, not one of wood or stone." The other gods might be a reality in the minds of their worshippers alone, as in the new creed of Euhemerus; or they might live apart in the interstices of the worlds, as Epicurus taught; or they might be implicit in the order of the family, state, or nature, as in Stoic pantheism; or they might carouse on Olympus. The essential thing for their recognition as gods was now the gratitude of men for the services which they had rendered. This sentiment, however, might create new gods among the living as well as main-

⁷ This is the cardinal error of Kornemann, "Zur Geschichte der Antiken Herrscherkulte", *Klio*, I. 51 ff. (1901). It is shared, however, by Wendland, *Σωτήρ*, *Zeitschrift f. neutest. Wissenschaft*, V. 335 ff. (1904), and by Bauer, *op. cit.* Wilamowitz (*Staat und Gesellschaft*, p. 151) in his latest work has emancipated himself from it. Bevan, "The Deification of Kings in the Greek Cities", *English Historical Review*, XVI. 632 (1901), all but escapes it.

⁸ Failure to grasp this idea is the one striking defect in the otherwise excellent appendix ("Der Hellenistische Herrscherkult") in Kaerst's *Gesch. d. Hell. Zeitalters*, II. 374 ff., and especially p. 414. See also this same author's *Studien zur Entwicklung der Monarchie im Altertum*, pp. 51 ff.

tain the cultus of those already created.⁹ In antiquity the third century B.C. was pre-eminently the age of science, enlightenment, and scepticism. Hence it was no accident that precisely this epoch nurtured Caesar-worship.

Deification of living rulers is, accordingly, a product, not of superstition, but of irreligion.¹⁰ There is, moreover, nothing Oriental about it; for its origin presupposes a condition which the Orient lacked¹¹—autonomous city-states, in whose midst there was place only for citizens, over whom could preside only gods or tyrants. And as a matter of fact prior to Alexander's time the Orient knew nothing identical with the Hellenistic worship of kings, for even in Egypt, as Wilcken has insisted recently, there was and always remained a difference in idea and cultus between Alexander and the Ptolemies who succeeded him, as the rulers of Greek cities, and Alexander and the Ptolemies as the lords of the native population.¹²

⁹ On the internationalizing of Athens in 229 B.C. the god Demos—whose *hegemon* was now Aphrodite—was associated by Eurykleides and Micion with the Charites, and the cult of their common *temenos* was made hereditary in the family of the two leaders (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 212). This act needs no commentary to those who have learned to think Greek. Demos was there to govern Athens; the Charites to denote the gratitude of the citizens to the foreign potentates on whose good-will the liberty of their city was dependent (Haussoullier, *s. v. Demos* in Daremburg et Saglio). The feeling thus symbolically expressed by the Athenians was the ultimate source of much contemporary so-called religion. It led men to *deify* potentates who ordered as well as benefitted and saved. The position of authority was, however, necessary since, otherwise, *citizens* who were *euergetae* and *soteres* must have become gods of their native towns (see below, note 26). It is the Roman Cicero who has formulated for us the theory of deification of rulers, as of so many other Hellenistic institutions. In *De Rep.*, I. 7, 12, he says: "Neque enim est ulla res in qua propius ad deorum numen virtus accedat humana quam civitates aut condere novas aut conservare iam conditas." And in the *Somnium Scipionis*, 5, we read: "Omnibus qui patriam conservaverint, adjuverint, auxerint, certum esse in caelo definitum locum, ubi beati aevio sempiterno fruantur; nihil est enim illi principi deo qui omnem mundum regit, quod quidem in terris fiat, acceptius quam concilia coetusque hominum iure sociati, quae civitates appellantur; harum rectores et conservatores hinc profecti huc revertuntur."

¹⁰ Bevan, p. 631.

¹¹ The reason why the chief European monarchy, Macedon (like Sicily under Hieron, where the case is identical), lacked the deification of kings (Wilcken, *loc. cit.* below, note 12) was not because it was out of contact with the East but because it had a constitutional and not an absolute monarch (Tarn, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXIX. 268, 1909; Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 190). When it was under Demetrius Poliorcetes it too had a divine king (*ibid.*, p. 148). The view that the custom is of Oriental origin was wrongfully maintained by Beurlier in a dissertation which long remained the only comprehensive treatment of the matter, *De divinis Honoribus quos acceperunt Alexander et Successores eius* (Paris, 1890).

¹² Mitteis and Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyruskunde*, vol. I. 1, pp. 98 ff. The same distinction was preserved in Roman Egypt, as Blumenthal has recently shown. ("Der Aegyptische Kaiserkult", *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, V. 317 ff., 1911.) The date at which Ptolemy Soter first appointed an imperial

To the latter they were the reincarnations of Ammon-Ra, and in their case the idea expressed by the adage, "The king is dead; long live the king", was fundamental. There could be no Pharaoh without an indwelling god; a god who was, of course, without beginning and without end—from everlasting unto everlasting; who simply revealed himself in the person of Alexander or Ptolemy. A similar conception of the king, as a great god incarnate in a ruler, made its appearance in the Asiatic world also in Hellenistic times; and, indeed, this idea, or one quite similar to it, proved helpful everywhere to overcome the reluctance of pious people to render divine honors to human beings. Alexander, no less than Mithradates and Mark Antony, was deified in Athens as a New Dionysus. Its acceptance in governmental circles, however, came only with the accession of Antiochos IV. to the throne of the Seleucids in 175 B.C., when he presented himself to his subjects as the *θεὸς Ἐπιφανῆς*. Between 323 B.C. and 270 B.C., on the other hand, the divinity of the living ruler depended in Greek political thinking wholly upon the initiative of the city-community. Thus it was the Rhodians who in 304 B.C. classified the first Ptolemy as the Saviour God; later half a generation had passed that the Islanders followed the lead thus given, and it was not till his death (283 B.C.) when his physical power ceased, that a substitute for it was obtained when Ptolemy II. ordained his father's deification throughout the empire.¹³ Only in 270 B.C., when the second Ptolemy was joined to his deceased, and hence deified, sister-queen Arsinoe in the cult of the *θεοὶ Ἀδελφοί*, did a successor of Alexander venture to request everywhere in his realm the position demanded by the great priest for the cult of Alexander the Great in Alexandria lies apparently between 311 B.C. (Rubensohn, *Elephantine-Papyri*, 1) and 289/8 B.C. (*ibid.*, 2 and 3). I conjecture that prior to this date Alexandria, like other colonies of Alexander, had the rights and governmental organs of an autonomous *πόλις* (Schubart, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, V. 35 ff., 1909); hence also the right to select its own priest to minister to its god Alexander. After this date Alexandria was apparently governed by Ptolemy and his officials (see Mitteis and Wilcken, *op. cit.*, vol. I. 1, pp. 14 ff.).

¹³ In the Seleucid empire also it was the need which Antiochus I. experienced of finding a legal basis for the enactments of his deceased father that led to the creation there in 281 B.C. of a *Staatskult* of Seleucus as Zeus Nikator. The worship of the living ruler was prescribed later by Antiochus II. (262–246 B.C.) Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, vol. III., 1, pp. 371 ff. Bevan (pp. 632 ff.) makes the honors of the living an anticipation of the honors due at death. This is to put the cart before the horse. There was no *Staatskult* of either Ptolemy I. or Seleucus I. during their lifetime. On the other hand, we may concede the probability that a halo tended to gather round the head of the son of one who was already a god-king, be he living or departed. Still, the crown-prince seems not to have received divine honors—at least in the imperial cult (see, for example, the case of Germanicus, below, note 45).

queror. Henceforth we have to distinguish in Egypt between the imperial cult (*Staatskult*) of the living ruler, which was prescribed by the monarch, and the city cult (*Städtekult*), which owed its existence to popular initiative. By the one loyalty was demanded, by the other it was tendered freely. Thereby the relation of ruler and subject ceased to be merely that of stronger and weaker and became instead legitimate and permanent. A Greek cult of double aspect thus appeared to supplement the worship accorded by the native Egyptians to their Pharaoh. Henceforth the Ptolemaic empire culminated from one point of view in the god-king Pharaoh == Ptolemy—and from another in the new hybrid imperial god Osiris == Serapis.

The step thus taken by Ptolemy Philadelphus was quickly taken by his rivals and contemporaries also. It was not, however, a long one; for already scores of Greek cities had acknowledged their allegiance to their rulers for the time being by elevating them to the hierarchy of their deities. Thus prior to 311 B.C. Skepsis had established a sacrifice, *agon*, procession, and fête (*θυσία, ἀγών, στεφανηφορία, πανήγυρις*), in honor of Antigonus Monophthalmus, and on coming definitely into his realm by the treaty of that year it provided him with the equipment of a god which could not be cancelled at a moment's notice—a *temenos*, altar, and idol.¹⁴ In 307 B.C. Athens had classified both Antigonus and his son Demetrius as its Saviour Gods.¹⁵ Four years later, when Demetrius revived the Corinthian League, Athens, now wishing to withdraw from its dependence upon him, chose to view him as bound by the conventions of the League to give the city complete internal freedom; but, as Plutarch tells us, the suzerain forced the Athenian assembly to decree that his will was supreme in all matters secular and religious.¹⁶ As yet there was no god Demos to contend with him for priority among the Olympians. In general it seems that the cities—viewing dependence as inevitable—voluntarily elected their rulers to godhood, thus saving their self-respect by escaping the necessity of yielding to illegal commands.¹⁷ Oftentimes the conferring of divine honors upon a ruler was little more than a compliment: it was a mere expression of respect or loyalty, and might signify as little as when a Spaniard offers his guest all his possessions.¹⁸ Not infrequently, however, the presence in the autonomous city of an *epi-*

¹⁴ Dittenberger, *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, 6, n. 6.

¹⁵ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 64, 108 ff.

¹⁶ Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 24; *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 121 ff.

¹⁷ The best account of the development just sketched is to be found in Kaerst's appendix already cited.

¹⁸ Holm, *The History of Greece* (Eng. trans.), IV. 63.

states showed that the divine ruler condescended to use other than spiritual weapons.¹⁹ Nowhere can a safe inference be made as to the practice and extent of monarchical interference in a city's government from the fact that it enrolled a king among its deities. The situation must be investigated in each particular case. It was, indeed, inevitable that a city which, like Athens, Rhodes, or Delos, strove to maintain a neutral position should have several god-kings at one and the same time. For this purpose a community was divisible into parts, over each of which a human deity might preside. Thus Athens had at times rival kings as the eponymous "heroes" of various of its *phylae*.²⁰

The world of the Greeks into which the Romans came, first in Magna Graecia and Sicily and then beyond the Adriatic, had become thoroughly habituated to the view that a monarch who created laws and did not have to obey them was a god; and though men were reconciled to this issue on different grounds—some by disbelief in all supernatural powers, others by the doctrine of an incarnation, which might be direct or by descent from one or both parents or more frequently from a remote ancestor, and still others by confusing the cultus of the living king with the heroic honors accorded to his departed predecessor, no one was unfamiliar with Alexander's device of legalizing absolutism by deification.

The question must, accordingly, be asked: Was this expedient used to give a legal basis for the demands put by Rome upon its Greek *amici* in excess of or without warrant in treaty stipulations? Theory presented no difficulty. Thus in the teaching which Aristotle²¹ had given to Alexander no distinction was drawn in this respect between the one and the few—monarchy and aristocracy.

If however there is an individual or more persons than one, although not enough to constitute the full complement of a State, so pre-eminent in their excess of virtue that neither the virtue of all the other citizens nor their political capacity is comparable to theirs, if they are several, or, if it is an individual, to his alone; such persons are not to be regarded any more as part of a State. It will be a wrong to them to treat them as worthy of mere equality when they are so vastly superior in virtue and political capacity, for any person so exceptional may well be com-

¹⁹ *IG.*, XII. 3, 320; 5, 2, 1061; Dittenberger, *OGIS.*, 254; cf. *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 47; Holleaux, *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, XVII. 52 ff. (1893), and Cardinali, *Il Regno di Pergamo*, pp. 275 ff.

²⁰ Into the theological question which arose when a Ptolemy or an Attalus obtained Athenian citizenship it is inexpedient to enter. He, of course, did not really mean to obey the laws and decrees of Athens. A courtesy was all that was involved. It is noteworthy that Attalus II. belonged to the *deme* Sypalettos, of the *phyle* Cecropis—not to the *phyle* Attalis. Ptolemy VI., on the other hand, was registered in the *phyle* Ptolemais (*IG.*, II. 966).

²¹ *Politics*, III. 13, 13 (p. 1284a).

pared to a deity upon the earth (*ώσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὼς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον*). . . . It remains then, as indeed seems natural, that all should render willing obedience to such an one, and that he and his like should thus be perpetual kings within their States.

Was, however, the step actually taken of adapting the Greek institution to the needs of the Roman government? The answer must be given in the affirmative.

To take the place of a Seleucus, Attalus, or Ptolemy, the Greeks invented a goddess Roma. "An sich", says Richter in Roscher's *Lexicon*,²² "hat also eine dea Roma keine Existenzberechtigung; sie ist denn auch der römischen Religion zunächst durchaus fremd und, wie Preller, *Röm. Mythol.* 2³, S. 353 sagt, den Römern von den Griechen aufgeredet worden."

Just as Seleucus, Attalus, and Ptolemy were honored with *agones*—Seleuceia, Attaleia, Ptolemaeia—so Romaia were instituted in honor of Roma.

The epithets Euergetes and Soter were the ones most commonly applied to the Hellenistic kings by their grateful subjects: the Roman senators and officials became Euergetae or Soteres.²³

The nature of the goddess, whose orders were recognized as legal by the Greek cities, was further defined by her association with the deity Pistis or Fides—the relation being symbolic of the fidelity to friendship and loyalty to obligation professed so insistently by the Romans.

Where on earlier occasions access to the Greek councils and ecclesiastas was given to privileged persons *μετὰ τὰ ἵερα καὶ τὰ βασιλικά* it is given henceforth *μετὰ τὰ ἵερα καὶ τοὺς Πρωμαλούς*.

The honors due a god-king on his arrival in a dependency involved a *pompe* or procession: whenever one of the Euergetae came to Athens in the latter half of the second century B.C. a procession of ephebes and magistrates met him to escort him as he entered. It was, doubtless, similar elsewhere. In Athens, moreover, a special pulpit was erected for him to occupy if he chose to address a message to the assembled people.

The god had his temple: the Roman senators and magistrates in Athens and elsewhere, in Sparta for example, had their *Romaion*—in Athens a temple-like structure with a stoa in front—in which they were lodged, presumably. We recall how Demetrius Poliorcetes took his residence in the Parthenon in the winter of 304–303

²² *S. v. Roma*, p. 130.

²³ *IG.*, II. 551. 94; Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* (second ed.), 521, 15; 930, 46; 329. Collitz-Baunack, *Sammlung d. Griech. Dialekt-Inschr.*, II. 2724; Kern, *Inschr. von Magnesia*, p. 94; Wendland, *loc. cit.*, p. 341, n. 4.

B.C. and in the *hieron* of Apollo at Delos in the preceding summer. The account is still extant of the expenditure made by the Delian *hieropoei* to clean up the mess (*κόπρος*) he left.

That Roma was primarily a political personage among the recognized deities of Athens is clear from her associations. When a republican government was restored in 229 B.C., after a generation of Macedonian rule, the god Demos was added to the cult of the Graces and a new *temenos* was laid out for them. When with Roman ascendancy the Romans became partners with the people in governing the Athenians, Roma also entered the coalition, and the priest who ministered to the triple alliance was styled "of Demos, Roma, and the Graces". The case was similar elsewhere. Thus, on the island of Delos, of which Athens got the government from Rome in 166 B.C., Demos became one partner of Hestia —the goddess of the civic hearth—and Roma another.²⁴

The conclusion seems reasonably safe, therefore, that the Roman people got the right²⁵ to make such demands as it pleased, or as *Fides* permitted, of the Greek cities with which its normal status was *pax et amicitia*, by the enrollment of Roma among the deities of each city, and the recognition accorded to the Roman governing aristocracy as in fact *θεοί*.

This being the significance of the worship of Roma, it is clear that Roman citizens could not with propriety take part in it any more than a Ptolemy could worship himself.²⁶ As a matter of

²⁴ References for the preceding paragraphs are given in *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 366 ff. and 383.

²⁵ In 170 B.C. a decree of the Senate was passed reserving to this body alone the right to make arbitrary demands. See Livy, XLIII. 6; 17, 2; Polybius, XXVIII. 3, 3, 13; 11, 16, 2. Cf. Niese, *Geschichte der Griechischen und Makedonischen Staaten*, III. 136 ff.

²⁶ Instructive in this connection is the Mytilenaean dedication with the following three inscriptions (Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 338–340): Γναίψ Ποντήψ Γναίω υψ Μεγάλω, αὐτοκράτορι, τῷ ἐνεργέτᾳ καὶ σωτῆρι καὶ κτίστῃ. | — οὐδω · · · ρίψ φιλοτάτριδι Θεοφάνῃ, τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ ἐνεργέτᾳ καὶ κτίστῃ δευτέρῳ τάς πατρίδος. | Ποτάμωνι Λεσβώνακτο[ς] τῷ ἐνεργέτᾳ καὶ σωτῆρος καὶ κτίστα τά[ς] πόλιο[ς]. In the case of Pompey no comment is necessary. Theophanes, however, was a Mytilenaean by birth; hence, seemingly, ineligible for divine honors in his own city. The fact was that he had received Roman citizenship (Cicero, *Pro Archia*, 24; Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 341), and, as such, might receive without impropriety the same homage as his patron Pompey. After his death he continued to be a god, and on a coin appears the inscription Θεὸς Θεοφάνης Μντ(ιληναῖων); Mionnet, *Description de Médailles Antiques*, III. 47, no. 108; Tacitus, *Annals*, VI. 18; Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 340. Potamon, on the other hand, was simply *princeps civium Mytilenaorum*: he appears, accordingly, in the inscription quoted above, as the son of the deceased "benefactor, savior and founder of the state", Lesbonax (Λεσβώναξ ἡρως νεός, Mionnet, III. 48, no. 116). The use in his case of the word *πόλιος*, in that of Theophanes of the word *πατρίδος*, emphasizes the difference in the status of the two men. A document published by Bechtel in Collitz's *Sammlung d. Griech. Dialekt-Inschr.*, I. 373, no. 1271, runs as

fact they did not do so. Roma did not become a Roman goddess till the time of Hadrian.²⁷ When the Romaia were celebrated in Athens in 152 B.C.²⁸ the commissioners in charge were Athenians—which is the more striking since in the same year two men with Roman names helped to administer the Ptolemaeia. When, moreover, in about 126 B.C. the Romaia were celebrated on Delos, where the largest part of the population was already Roman, of the twenty-one commissioners in charge seventeen were Athenians and the other four Greeks.²⁹ As early as 140 B.C. the Italians on Delos formed an association, with three free-born and three freedmen *magistri*, or masters, at its head, for the worship of Mercury, Maea, and Minerva, together with the Lares *compitales*. Some thirty years later they reorganized their association and admitted to their circle of deities Apollo and Neptune, adding at the same time three additional freemen and three additional freedmen to their magisterial board. A little later they took possession of a fine new headquarters in which were housed Mercury, Neptune, and Apollo, as well as the *Italici*.³⁰ At this time, moreover, occurred a differentiation on which we wish to lay special stress. In the place of earlier worship—an enclosure, or *compitum*, at a central crossroads in the business part of the town—the Lares were henceforth the chief objects of devotion. For their cult, in which the slaves and freedmen had the largest part on Delos as elsewhere, a board of attendants (*ministri*)—the so-called *Kompetaliastae*, was instituted. None of these officials was ever a free-born Roman: some were freedmen and the rest Greeks. Their task was particularly the celebration of the well-known plebeian and servile fête, the Compitalia. With the disappearance of full Roman citizens from its charge and that of the *compitum* generally a further change

follows: Ποτάμων Δεσπόνακτος, τῷ σωτῆρι καὶ ἐνεργέτᾳ καὶ κτίστᾳ τὰς πόλιος. The question must therefore be asked: Did Potamon also receive the Roman citizenship? It is not necessary to make this assumption. In an inscription of the second century A.D. (*Eph. Epigr.*, II. 11, no. 7) we find a certain Artemisia designated τὰν ἀπίγονον Ποτάμωνος τῷ νομοθέτᾳ καὶ Δεσπόνακτος τῷ φιλοσόφῳ. It thus appears that Potamon was at some time appointed *dictator reipublicae constitutuenda*. While creator of the law (*νομοθέτης*) he was of course above it. On Dittenberger's interpretation of the third inscription from the Mytilenaean dedication (*Syll.*, I. 546) he may have been in this authoritative position at the time the divine honors were accorded to Pompey and Theophanes.

²⁷ Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, pp. 280 ff.

²⁸ *IG.*, II. 953.

²⁹ *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 383, n. 1.

³⁰ With dedications made for example 'Ερμεὶ καὶ Ἰταλικοῖς or 'Απόλλωνι καὶ Ἰταλικοῖς (*BCH.*, XXXIV. 406, 1910) cf. those made, according to Plutarch, *Flamin.*, 16, Τίτων καὶ Ἡρακλεῖ, Τίτων καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι. The *Italici* were, in fact, at this time masters of Delos. *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 434.

could be made without impropriety in that an image of Roma and another of Pistis or Fides could be dedicated by the *Kompetaliastae*.³¹ These added deities received the homage of the rabble, of those whom Scipio Africanus the Younger had haughtily addressed a generation earlier as the “stepsons of Italy”. The worship of Roma was, in fact, an acknowledgment of political inferiority. No free-born Roman citizen would think of having part in it at this time.

The living representatives of Roma, *i. e.*, the Roman *optimates*, were generally lumped together in the Greek cities as the Euergetae or the Soteres. One of them—the holder, naturally, of an important military or provincial command—might be singled out for particular reasons for special divine honors. Thus a Chalcidian hymn to the deified Flamininus is still extant as follows:³²

Πίστιν δὲ Ῥωμαίων σέβομεν
τὰν μεγαλευκτοτάταν ὄρκοις φυλάσσειν.
μέλπετε κουραι,
Ζῆνα μέγαν Ῥώμαν τε Τίτον θ' ἄμα Ῥωμαίων τε Πίστιν.
ιῆς Παιάν, ω Τίτε σῶτερ.

The deification of Q. Mucius Scaevola, proconsul of Asia in 94 B.C., is attested by Mukieia celebrated long afterwards throughout this province³³—so active was gratitude, or to speak with the Athenians of 229 B.C., the Charites, to create new gods in this age. Sulla got Sulleia in Athens, Mark Antony Antonieia,³⁴ and other governors, like Metellus in Pergamum,³⁵ Pompey in many places,³⁶ and the infamous Verres in Sicily,³⁷ were similarly honored. Even Cicero, somewhat to his embarrassment, found himself the recipient of divine rites in Cilicia.³⁸ Hence there is nothing odd in the appearance of Sebasta for Augustus. What is a trifle unusual, especially in view of the splendid isolation of Julius Caesar, who was a god for the Romans as well as their foretime subjects,³⁹ is that

³¹ For the development just sketched see *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 355 ff., 396 ff.

³² Plutarch, *Flamin.*, 16.

³³ Dittenberger, *OGIS*, 438, 439.

³⁴ *IG.*, II. 481, 482.

³⁵ Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 344.

³⁶ See, for example, above, note 26.

³⁷ *Contra Verrem, Actio II.* 2, 154.

³⁸ Cicero, *Ad Quintum Fratrem*, I. 1, 26; *Ad Atticum*, 5, 21.

³⁹ The first universal divine king (after Alexander) was of course Julius Caesar. Thus he is defined in *CIG.*, II. 2957 as *τὸν ἀπὸ Ἀρεως καὶ Ἀφροδείτης, θεὸν ἐπιφανὴν καὶ κοινὸν τοῦ ἀνθρωπίνου βίου σωτῆρα*; and in *IG.*, XII. 5. 1, 557 as *τὸν θεὸν καὶ αὐτοκράτορα καὶ σωτῆρα τῆς οἰκουμένης*. Octavian, as *Σεβαστὸς* (not as *deus*), was *σωτῆρ τῶν Ἑλλήνων τε καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης πάσσος* (*Inschr. von Olympia*, 366), or *σωτῆρ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους* (*Inscriptions in the British Museum*, IV. 1, no. 894). See

Augustus demanded for Roma first place in all divine honors accorded to himself.⁴⁰ In reality this was simply the formal expression of his theory of dyarchical government; that in the provinces, whatever might be the case in Italy, the Roman Republic and Augustus Caesar were dual and absolute authorities. To this end the movement towards deification of rulers was guided by the new government so effectively that during the lifetime of Octavian temples or altars of *Roma et Augustus* appeared not only in the Greek but also in all the western or barbarian provinces.⁴¹ And so far down was the idea of dual subjection brought in this way that the joint cult was inaugurated not only in the centres of provincial government but also in individual towns and villages.⁴² Indeed, as we have seen, it belonged historically rather to the several city-states than to the territorial complex.

On his death Augustus became *divus* among Roman citizens. As a Roman magistrate his work was subject to the approval of the Roman Senate.⁴³ It could withhold this at any time and particularly at his decease. The *damnatio memoriae* was, in fact, the rescinding of all the emperor's *acta* which rested upon his will alone. Naturally, what was particularly affected thereby was his work in the provincial sphere, where he stood beside and not under the goddess Roma. The approval of such *acta* was given by deification (see above, p. 33). Significantly enough, and of itself affording clear proof of the constitutional import of Caesar-worship, it was among the Romans alone that Augustus and his successors, on their death and apotheosis, became *divi*. In Rome and the Roman municipalities the series of those entitled to divine honors begins with *Julius divus* and ends with the *genius* of the living *princeps*.⁴⁴ In the provincial cultus, on the other hand, only the *Augustus* (and *Aug-*

also Kaibel, *Epigr.*, 978, which Wendland (Σωτήρ, p. 343) quotes in his further development of this subject. As Augustus (Σεβαστός) Tiberius also was a universal deity (see below, note 45, and particularly note 59).

⁴⁰ Suetonius, *Aug.*, 52: "Templa quamvis sciret etiam proconsulibus decerni solere, in nulla tamen provincia nisi communi suo Romaeque nomine recepit." Egypt was in this respect, as generally, exceptional. See Blumenthal, "Der Aegyptische Kaiserkult", *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, V. 317 ff. (1911).

⁴¹ Hirschfeld, "Zur Geschichte des Römischen Kaisercultes", *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, vol. XXXV., 2, p. 849 (1888), makes an exception of Spain, but see Kornemann, *Klio*, I. 101, and Heinen, *ibid.*, XI. 158, n. 1 (1911).

⁴² Heinen, p. 167, n. 4.

⁴³ Eduard Meyer, "Kaiser Augustus", *Kleine Schriften*, p. 479.

⁴⁴ See for example the *Lex de Imperio Vespasiani* and the *Leges of Salpensa* and Malaca, §§ 25 ff.

usta) of the time being was considered.⁴⁵ The reason for this is obvious. It was in the case of the Romans alone that a need existed for legalizing arbitrary actions. The provincials had to respond solely to the orders of living emperors: for the actions of the departed Roma, on their deification, acquired complete responsibility.

As is well known, the system of provincial proconsuls and *legati* was paralleled for fiscal purposes by the system of equestrian *procuratores*. It should be equally a matter of general knowledge that it was paralleled also by the hierarchy of provincial *sacerdotes* of *Roma et Augustus*; for through this agency the Roman Empire was shown by one and the same institution both to be a despotism and to rest, not upon superior force alone, but upon the consent of the governed.⁴⁶

To worship *Roma et Augustus* was to confess subjection to Italy. That was not becoming in the case of free-born citizens of Rome. Augustus accordingly opposed the Romans when they sought to put him above the laws by giving him the homage of a god.⁴⁷ The citizens, of course, were no longer resident in Rome alone but in all the towns of Italy as well. Inside Italy the Roman remedy for the evils inherent in the particularism of city-states had borne fruit in the municipal system of the *Lex Julia*. By acquiring citizenship in Rome the citizens of the Italian towns escaped from the dictation of an outside, and hence tyrannical, power: they did not need to recognize the goddess Roma. As citizens of Rome they elected their *princeps*, or chief citizen, to high office at home and imperial position abroad: they could not worship him as the

⁴⁵ Hirschfeld, pp. 848 ff. The exclusion of the subordinate and female members of the Julian house was effected gradually and with difficulty. Heinen, pp. 175 ff.; Wilamowitz and Zucker, *Sitzungsber. d. Berl. Akad. d. Wiss.*, XXXVIII. 813 (1911). The provincials tended to proclaim their loyalty to all the members of what was to them the "royal family". The administrative attitude is well disclosed in an edict of Germanicus issued while on his visit to Egypt (Wilamowitz and Zucker, *ibid.*, p. 797): Γερμανικὸς Καῖσαρ Σεβαστὸς τὸν νίβον, Θεοῦ Σεβαστοῦ υἱωνός, ἀνθίτατος λέγει. τὴν μὲν εἴνοιαν ὑμῶν ἣν αἰεὶ ἐπιδεκνυσθε, ὅταν με <ε>ἰδόητε, ἀποδέχομαι. τὰς δὲ ἐπιφθόνους[ς] ἔμοι καὶ ισοθέους ἐκφωνήσεις ὑμῶν ἐξ [α]παντοποῦναι· πρέπουσι γὰρ μόνω τῷ σωτῆρι δυντας καὶ εὐεργέτη τοῦ σύνπαντος τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους, τῷ ἐμῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐμῷ τὲ μάρμη. τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα ἐν ὑποπρετείᾳ(?) ἔστιν τῆς ἑκένων θειότητος, ὡς ἔάμι μοι μὴ πεισθῆτε, ἀνανκάτε με μὴ πολλάκις ὑμεῖν ἐνφανίζεσθαι. See further in this connection Kahrstedt, "Frauen auf Antiken Münzen", *Klio*, X. 289 ff. (1910).

⁴⁶ Thus Tacitus (*Ann.*, XIV. 31) says in regard to the establishing of the institution in Britain: "Ad hoc templum divo Claudio constitutum quasi arx aeternae dominationis aspiciebatur, delectique sacerdotes specie religionis omnis fortunas effundebant."

⁴⁷ Suetonius, *Aug.*, 52; Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, pp. 458 ff.

god Augustus without stultifying their own action.⁴⁸ Let us see what they actually did in the matter.

It is unnecessary to discuss the entire collection of the materials bearing upon the deification of Augustus which Heinen has made in a recent issue of *Klio*. We have merely to deal with the instances he adduces to prove that the first emperor was worshipped in Italy during his lifetime. The fact must be conceded. In at least eighteen municipalities priests, shrines, or altars are attested.⁴⁹ Moreover, it is clear that the Roman citizens resident in the provinces joined, on occasion, the provincials in the worship of *Roma et Augustus*;⁵⁰ and it must also be observed that the chief priests chosen in the western provinces for the observance of the imperial cult were regularly in possession of the Roman citizenship.⁵¹

These are the facts: they must not be misinterpreted. This is done, I believe, when evidence is found in them for the gradual revelation by Augustus⁵² of his alleged real intent that Romans should regard him as a magistrate in mere form, as in substance an absolute monarch.

The truth is that the inhabitants of the Roman world could not be divided simply into citizens and non-citizens. There were from of old those whom Mommsen has designated the *Halbfreien*—the freedmen; with whom may be included those foreigners, *i. e.*, provincials, upon whom the citizenship of Rome had been conferred. The position of the freedmen under the republic had been an ambiguous one; after Augustus it was more closely defined.

It is clear that Augustus did not regard them as his equals. Thus he classified them as ineligible for invitations to his house, prohibited the intermarriage of senators and freedwomen, and required them to take by law the praenomen as well as the nomen of their manumittor—a tell-tale badge of clientage. In the army, when they served at all, it was as policemen and on the fleet, not with the Romans. Moreover, whereas Julius Caesar in his magnificent disregard for old distinctions had admitted freedmen to the offices in

⁴⁸ *Klio*, XI. 129 ff. (1911).

⁴⁹ Cf. Heinen, p. 175. The towns are: Cumae, Puteoli, Pompeii, Naples, Tarra-
racina, Ostia, Praeneste, Casinum, Beneventum, Fanum Fortunae, Asisium, Perusia,
Pisae, Forum Clodii, Luna(?), Cremona, Verona, and Pola.

⁵⁰ *Revue des Études Grecques*, XIV. 37 ff. (1901); Heinen, p. 167, n. 4. The attitude of Augustus towards the Romans who had taken up their residence in the provinces is disclosed by the fact that they served in the army not with the Italians, but in volunteer cohorts. Eduard Meyer, *Kleine Schriften*, p. 485.

⁵¹ Hirschfeld, p. 851. The list of Spanish priests is given in *CIL*, II. 750 ff.; the Gallic by Auguste Bernard, *Le Temple d'Auguste*, pp. 51 ff.

⁵² Like all the institutions of Augustus the cult of the emperor was organized, not at one stroke, but tentatively and gradually.

his new colonies, Augustus not only excluded them rigidly from all Roman and municipal magistracies, but even went so far as to take from them the franchise altogether.⁵³

To one semi-magistracy, however, they had been eligible from of old under the republic—to the board of *magistri*⁵⁴ which had administered for the freedmen, slaves, and ignoble rabble of Rome the cultus of the Lares of the *compita*. To the freedmen Augustus left this *honor*. It was the *Kompetaliastae* on Delos, it will be observed, who inaugurated there the cult of Roma and Fides. In Rome the *magistri* rendered a similar homage to the emperor who was their lord; for quite as much to make clear the real political status of the mob as to satisfy the plebeian clamor for a new god Augustus had an effigy of his own *genius* put between the figures of the twain Lares which were erected anew in the chapels at the street corners of the capital.

Freedmen might worship the *princeps*, not freemen; hence in the cities of Italic and Latin right everywhere the cult of Augustus was put in the hands of Augustales—freedmen chosen for the purpose by the municipal senates. Senators, knights, provincials, and freedmen—each class had its duties assigned and agents designated for their performance, in the case of the two former, collaborators with Augustus in the work of governing, in the case of the two latter, witnesses to the beneficence of the empire and spokesmen for the loyalty of the governed.⁵⁵

The worship of Augustus was, accordingly, permissible from the start among the freedmen of Italy as well as among those abroad. To become a *sevir Augustalis* was, in fact, an honor highly esteemed by them, and only the most wealthy and distinguished freedmen attained to it. The same was the case with the provincial priesthood of *Roma et Augustus*. Those who held it were the

⁵³ Mommsen, *Staatsrecht*, III. 420 ff.

⁵⁴ They were chosen ἐκ τοῦ δῆμου (Dio, LV. 8, 6); *e plebe* (Suetonius, *Aug.*, 30, 1). In one case *ingenui* appear among the *magistri* (*CIL.*, VI. 975), otherwise they are *liberti*. Their *ministri* were slaves. See Heinen, p. 166, n. 3.

⁵⁵ How sensitively Caesar-worship responded to governmental changes in Rome is apparent from what happened in the provinces under Tiberius. As is well known, he had the right to elect the magistrates taken from the comitia and given to the senate. Thereupon Roma was displaced by θεὸς Σύγκλητος or λεπὰ Σύγκλητος (Hirschfeld, p. 842). As Tacitus (*Ann.*, IV. 15; *cf.* 55-56) says: "Decrevere Asiae urbes templum Tiberio matrique eius ac senatui", and as he makes Tiberius say (*ibid.*, IV. 37): "exemplum [Augusti] promptius secutus sum, quia cultui meo veneratio senatus adiungebatur". The impropriety of the situation presented in the western provinces was felt keenly by a stickler for formal correctness like Tiberius. Hence he declared (*ibid.*, IV. 37): "omnes per provincias effigie numinum sacrari ambitiosum, superbum; et vanescet Augusti honor, si promiscis adulatioibus vulgatur"; and he refused to permit his worship in the Occident (Hirschfeld, p. 842).

most eminent of the provincials: in the western provinces they were, in fact, men who through securing Roman citizenship had all but disqualified themselves for the office. The most distinguished persons in provincial society were none too good to testify to the gratitude and devotion of those whom they represented at the various *arae Romae et Augusti*.

The worship of Augustus in Italy could not be confined to freedmen any more than the recipients of the Roman citizenship could be excluded from the provincial cultus. It tended irresistibly to spread to other Italians. The Greeks for example in Cumae, Puteoli, Naples, and Pompeii, lapsed easily into the practice of their kinsmen beyond the sea, especially since that had been their own practice up to the extension of the citizenship to all Italy at the time of the Social War. Communities which owed their origin and laws to Augustus, as did the colonies he had founded in Italy, tended to assume toward him the dependent attitude proper to the foreign cities to whom his will and Roma's was continuously law.⁵⁶ Besides, the worship of the ruler had become, as we have seen, a complex phenomenon in the days between Alexander and Augustus. Heroic honors tended by anticipation to be rendered to one who on death was, and had, to become *divus*. The divinity voted to Julius Caesar could not but put a halo upon the head of his son. With the idea of an incarnate god courtiers and court poets had at one time aimed to familiarize the Romans;⁵⁷ but the *princeps* would have none of it. For when he exalted his house by emphasizing its descent from Venus he did nothing that any Greek or Roman nobleman might not do with perfect propriety. All nobles were, as Homer says, *διογένεις*. On the other hand, that he like all men had an immortal, and hence divine, *genius*, he like all Romans believed implicitly, and for soldiers and other citizens to take oath by this, offer sacrifice to it, and erect temples, shrines, or altars for its worship, involved no political or religious impropriety.⁵⁸ The *genius* of the *princeps* and *imperator*, like the *juno* of Livia, was, of course, different in power, if not in kind, from that of other Romans. An *ara* or *templum Augusti* was, however, everywhere objectionable and was probably sanctioned nowhere,

⁵⁶ Hirschfeld, p. 838.

⁵⁷ Horace, *Odes*, I. 2, 24 ff. (28/7 B.C.) See further, Heinen, p. 150, n. 3.

⁵⁸ See Otto in Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll, *Realencyclopädie d. class. Altertumswissenschaft*, VII. 1, s. v. *Genius*: "Er ist ausserhalb des Menschen gedacht, darüber kann für die ältere Zeit gar kein Zweifel sein. Er ist *deus*, und zwar *comes* des Menschen, dem er zugehört und der unter seiner *tutela* lebt. Man betet zu ihm, man schwört bei ihm, man opfert ihm."

unless it be in the case of the freedmen.⁵⁹ Nor is any stronger argument as to its inadmissibility to be found than in what is sometimes advanced as proof of its toleration—the erection at Rome of altars of Pax Augusta, Victoria Augusta, Fortuna Augusta, or Fortuna Redux Augusta. What is avoided by these terms is obvious. The emperor was a complex of divine qualities, but he was himself a man.⁶⁰

WILLIAM SCOTT FERGUSON.

⁵⁹ The one comprehensive title for Octavian was, of course, *Augustus*—*Σεβαστός*. This was vague enough to cover the relation of the *princeps*, as the possessor of a divine *genius* and the son of the *divus Julius*, to the free-born Romans, yet full enough of latent connotation to reveal the god to freedmen and provincials. Under Tiberius the title *Σεβαστή* is applied by the Greeks to the senate also (Hirschfeld, p. 842, n. 41).

⁶⁰ How Augustus thought of his honors is revealed by the anecdote found in Quintilian (*Inst. Or.*, VI. 3, 77): “Augustus nuntiantibus Tarragonensibus palمام in ara eius enatam, ‘apparet’, inquit, ‘quam saepe accendatis’”.